

EXHIBIT 23

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
3 EASTERN DIVISION
4 IN RE: NATIONAL) MDL No. 2804
5 PRESCRIPTION OPIATE)
6 LITIGATION) Case No.
7) 1:17-MD-2804
8)
9)
10 THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO) Hon. Dan A.
11 ALL CASES) Polster
12)
13)

10 Sunday, May 5, 2019
11 — — —
12 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO FURTHER
13 CONFIDENTIALITY REVIEW
14 — — —
15)
16 Videotaped Deposition of MEREDITH B.
17 ROSENTHAL, Ph.D., VOLUME 2, held at Robins
18 Kaplan LLP, 800 Boylston Street, Suite 2500,
19 Boston, Massachusetts, commencing at
20 8:04 a.m., on the above date, before
21 Michael E. Miller, Fellow of the Academy of
22 Professional Reporters, Registered Diplomate
23 Reporter, Certified Realtime Reporter and
24 Notary Public.
25)

24 — — —
25 GOLKOW LITIGATION SERVICES
 877.370.3377 ph | fax 917.591.5672
 deps@golkow.com

1 misconduct.

2 I think it's a little bit less
3 clear about how that analysis might be used
4 to assess liability for distributors. I have
5 not been asked to do that, but the indirect
6 analysis, because it's not measuring the
7 conduct of a specific group, could be open to
8 a broader interpretation.

9 Q. Have you disclosed any opinions
10 that, based upon your indirect model, you
11 draw conclusions about distributor
12 defendants' conduct?

13 A. I have not. I have not drawn
14 those conclusions.

15 Q. And you mentioned the detailing
16 data, but just to be clear, you did not
17 include in your direct model any data series
18 that you understood were measuring the
19 conduct of the distributor defendants; is
20 that correct?

21 MR. SOBOL: Objection, asked
22 and answered.

23 A. I have not measured the conduct
24 of the distributors or included that in my
25 model.